DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 451 JC 780 075

AUTHOR Schmoeller, Victoria; Kester, Donald L.
TITLE This Model Management and Evaluation System of a Large $1.5 Million Program for Handicapped Students in All Nine Los Angeles Community Colleges Provides Both Cost Benefit Analysis and Program Quality Information.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.; Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, Calif.
PUB DATE 17 Nov 77
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the California Educational Research Association (56th, Los Angeles, California, November 17, 1977). Some pages may reproduce poorly; Not available in paper copy due to print quality of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Community Colleges; Cost Effectiveness; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Handicapped Students; *Junior Colleges; *Management Systems; *Models; Multicampus Districts; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *School Services; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS Los Angeles Community Colleges CA

The document presents a three-level model management and evaluation system for the Los Angeles Community College District's programs for the handicapped, which meets local college, district, and state-level management and evaluation needs. Five sections discuss: (1) the educational philosophy of the community college and the handicap programs; (2) the needs of the population in terms of physical, communication, and learning disabilities; (3) program goals in terms of facilities, special educational materials, educational and mobility assistance, transportation, and developmental services; (4) special programs at the nine colleges; (5) 1976-77 district-wide program budget; (6) 1977-78 district-wide program budget; (7) combined program areas, objectives, and cost benefit matrix; (8) evaluation procedures; and (9) selected objectives from program categories. Appended material includes a description of the three initial program evaluation services, formats of the evaluation and management plan and timeline, and a copy of a student intake form. Three bibliographies conclude the document, with the first listing 97 titles on educational program evaluation and audit, the second listing 36 titles regarding handicapped programs, and the third listing 20 titles on cost-benefit analyses. (LH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED148451

THIS MODEL MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION SYSTEM OF A LARGE $1.5 MILLION PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN ALL NINE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGES PROVIDES BOTH COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM QUALITY INFORMATION

by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VICTORIA SCHMOELLER, M.Ed.
District Coordinator of Programs and Services for the Handicapped
Los Angeles Community College District

and

DONALD L. KESTER, Ph.D.
Consultant, Educational Program Evaluation and Audit
Division of Program, Evaluation, Research and Pupil Services
Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald L. Kester
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Presented on

November 17, 1977

at the

56th Annual Conference of the California Educational Research Association
Los Angeles, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 780 075

This paper is a joint contribution of the management and staff team of the Program for Handicapped Students of the Los Angeles Community College District, and of the Division of Program Evaluation, Research, and Pupil Services of the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, with the above-named persons acting as authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 1

INTRODUCTION 3

OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER 4

PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT . . . . . .

DISTRICT-WIDE AND COLLEGE LEVEL NEEDS OF POPULATION TO BE SERVED . 7

TABLE I - BREAKDOWN BY COLLEGE 8

PROGRAM GOALS 9

SERVICES AND PROGRAMS 11

BUDGET SUMMARY (1976-77 District-wide Budget) 14

BUDGET SUMMARY (1977-78 District-wide Budget) 15

COMBINED PROGRAM AREAS, OBJECTIVES AND COST BENEFIT MATRIX 16

EVALUATION PROCEDURES 18

EXAMPLES OF OBJECTIVES IN SELECTED PROGRAM CATEGORIES 19

APPENDIX I 22

APPENDIX II 23

APPENDIX III 24

APPENDIX IV 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY I 26

BIBLIOGRAPHY II 34

BIBLIOGRAPHY III 37

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

OFFICE OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Those at the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools who helped bring about the evolution of the three initial evaluation services[1] should be acknowledged. The County Office "change agents" or "prime movers" include Dr. Richard M. Clowes, Superintendent; Dr. E. Maylon Drake, currently Chief Deputy Superintendent (formerly Assistant Superintendent for Educational Programs and Services); Dr. Gordon Footman, Director, and Dr. Warren Newman, Assistant Director, Division of Program Evaluation, Research, and Pupil Services; and Dr. Jean Wiener, Dr. Ruth Cohen, and Dr. Bill Turner -- all consultants in the Division of Program Evaluation, Research, and Pupil Services. The members of the Los Angeles County Board were also supportive of the initial and sustained program evaluation and audit efforts. They currently are: Robert M. Bock, President; Dr. Daniel L. Towler, Vice-President; Lawrence J. Kaplan, D.D.S.; Mrs. Louise H. Marsh, member; Dr. Earl Pullias, member; Vincent H. Simpson, member; and Mrs. Kathryn Vanderhook, member.

THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Los Angeles Community District Board of Trustees have been very supportive of the handicapped programs and services district-wide. These trustees currently are: Mr. Arthur H. Bronson, President; Mr. Wallace Albertson, Vice-President; Dr. Ralph Richardson, member; Mr. J. William Orozco, member; Dr. Monroe F. Richman, member; Ms. Gwen Moore, member; and Dr. Rick Tuttle, member.

For their continued and timely support and cooperation, acknowledgement is also given to: Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor; Dr. John T. McCuen, Vice-Chancellor--Educational Planning and Development; Dr. William D. Allen, Director--Career and Occupational Education.

PROFESSIONALS

The authors would also like to acknowledge the professionals who participated directly in the planning and implementation of this Model Management and Evaluation System for the Comprehensive Handicap Program. They are: Chadwick Woo, Jr., Los Angeles City College; Jack Oliver, East Los Angeles College; Steven Harshfield, Los Angeles Harbor College; Jack Kearney, Los Angeles Mission College; Jim Lagerstrom, Los Angeles Pierce College; Henryette Fisher, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College; George Kopoulos, Los Angeles Valley College; and Burton Amos, West Los Angeles College.

---

[1] The three initial evaluation services were: (1) Educational Program Evaluation Planning, (2) Educational Program Audit, and (3) Research. A description of each of these services is shown in Appendix I of this paper. More recently, another evaluation service, Program Evaluation Implementation, was developed, and is now also offered to the ninety-five districts in Los Angeles County.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (Cont'd)

OTHER

In addition, the authors would also like to acknowledge Dr. Ray Pitts who, at the beginning of the development of this Model System, was the Dean of Academic Affairs, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. In that capacity, Dr. Pitts provided the team with the initial guidance in developing this Model Evaluation and Management System that by design has not only district-wide and local college level application, but also possible state-wide applications.

INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles Community College District is the largest in the nation because it has as its base a general population of four million people, and it actually serves a population of over 140,000 students enrolled in its nine community colleges. As this district moved to evaluate its services to its handicapped students, it formed a Program Evaluation Management Team that focused on developing a Model Management and Evaluation System that satisfied the three different levels of: (a) state-wide or California level, (b) district-wide or Los Angeles Community College District level, and, of course, (c) local college level.

Early in the planning of the system during the Spring of 1977, it was recognized that both the district and college level plans had to interface naturally and easily with each other. It was also recognized that the system had to satisfy the state regulations that demanded qualitative and quantitative results of the costly $1.5 million handicap program. In addition, it was recognized that an initial step toward future-cost-benefit analysis had to be taken in the early stages of planning and program implementation if the component areas of the Model Evaluation and Management System were to become the same as the state-wide funding categories. It was in this way budget-category information became directly related to the attainment or non-attainment of program objectives and activities.

OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER

The Management and Staff Team of the Programs for the Handicapped of the Los Angeles Community College District, with the assistance of Dr. Kester, began meeting in the Spring of 1977 to develop a Model Management and Evaluation System with district-wide and individual college application. With the expertise and support of the Academic Affairs Unit of the California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office, a state-wide application component was soon added to the Model program.

In this way, the three-level Management and Evaluation System evolved. This three-level system had not only district-wide application, and college level application, but also had state-wide ramifications. A natural consequence of the goal of developing a working three-level Evaluation and Management Model was the development of philosophy and goal statements that were not only compatible with the districts' philosophy and educational goals, but also in total compliance with state legislation under which the handicapped programs are funded.

Recognizing that they were now developing this three-level Model, the Team outlined its tasks as follows:

1. Assessment of student needs.

2. Identification of the target groups of handicapped students to be served.

3. Development of goals, objectives and activities that would correlate directly with the state funding categories. (In this way, budget-category information became directly related to the attainment or non-attainment of program objectives and activities.)

With state representatives, district representatives, and local college representatives in attendance at the Team planning meetings, an interesting political reciprocity, or give-and-take, process naturally developed. State representatives identified high priority goals and objectives with state-wide application, district representatives identified high priority objectives with district-wide application, and college representatives identified high priority goals and objectives with local application. Through parliamentary procedures, a merging of all three sets of goals and objectives was incorporated within the system to the satisfaction of all involved.

For example, the local college representatives wanted objectives that required the district to assume leadership in: (a) continuous monitoring of budget and accounting reports, (b) the establishment of task forces that would study and report recommendations in areas that were in need of further development, and (c) provision of district-wide, staff-development programs.

On the other hand, the district representatives recommended, for example, that the quality control questionnaires to students, faculty, and staff be the same across all nine colleges.

The state representatives suggested, for example, a final report on program objectives attainment level with recommendations as needed for possible revision of program activities be prepared both locally and district-wide.

OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER (cont'd)

The reader will find these above - mentioned segments, and the following segments, of this paper presented below in display 1.

DISPLAY 1

Section I	-	Philosophy Statement
Section II	-	District-wide and College Level Needs of Population to be served
Section III	-	Program Goals
Section IV	-	Services and Programs
Section V	-	Budget Summary (1976-77 District-wide Budget)
Section VI	-	Budget Summary (1977-78 District-wide Budget)
Section VII	-	Combined Program Areas, Objectives and Cost Benefit Matrix
Section VIII	-	Evaluation Procedures
Section IX	-	Examples of Objectives in Selected Program Categories.
Appendix I	-	Description of Evaluation Services Now Offered by the Division of Program Evaluation, Research and Pupil Services
Appendix II	-	Format of the Evaluation and Management Plan
Appendix III	-	Format for Evaluation Timeline
Appendix IV	-	Intake Form

At the end of this paper the reader will find three current bibliographies.

The first bibliography provides the reader with an overview of entries in the area of program management and evaluation. Thus bibliography I provides general guidelines and specific points of view important to the evaluation of any educational program.
The second bibliography has entries in the area of cost-benefit analysis. This useful management approach is discussed in sections V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX, but especially in section VII. Where the "cost-benefit matrix" is presented.
The third bibliography provides current entries in the area of administering & evaluating programs designed especially for handicapped students.

SECTION I

PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT'S PHILOSOPHY

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY. It is the conviction of the Los Angeles Community Colleges that each individual should have the opportunity to develop to his greatest potential. To that end, it is the function of the colleges to provide, for the members of the community, learning experiences which will assist them to live effectively as workers, family members, and citizens.

The functions of the Community Colleges are:

1. OCCUPATIONAL. An occupational education program planned to offer the student basic, business, technical, and professional curricula to develop skills which can lead to employment and job advancement.

2. TRANSFER. A college transfer program which enables the students who complete two years of study to continue upper division (third year) work at accredited four-year colleges and universities.

3. GENERAL EDUCATION. A program of general education comprised of planned experiences which develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for the student to be effective as a person, a family member, a worker, and a loyal citizen.

4. GUIDANCE. A guidance program incorporating vocational, educational, and personal counseling to assist the student in the selection and pursuit of a life work compatible with his interests, aptitudes, and abilities.

5. COMMUNITY SERVICES. A program of community services offered to meet the cultural, educational, and vocational needs of the community.

6. CONTINUING EDUCATION. A program of continuing education comprised of graded and ungraded classes to provide opportunities for personal and occupational competence that supplement formal full-time college attendance.

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT'S HANDICAP PROGRAMS' PHILOSOPHY

In keeping with the district-wide philosophy, the Handicap Programs of the Los Angeles Community Colleges will insure within the limits of their resources, that those handicapped students attending the colleges are provided with equal access both physical, academic, and attitudinal to the educational opportunities offered district-wide. Support services and programs will focus on the integration of the disabled students into the regular college programs.

SECTION II

DISTRICT-WIDE AND COLLEGE LEVEL NEEDS OF POPULATION TO BE SERVED

The Los Angeles Community College District serves a general population of 4,000,000 in Los Angeles County in an area of 882 square miles. The District is half the size of Los Angeles County. There are currently 140,000 students enrolled in the District's nine colleges which serve the city's center (Los Angeles City College; Los Angeles Trade Technical College); the east side (East Los Angeles College); the harbor area (Los Angeles Harbor College); the west side (West Los Angeles College); the heavily populous San Fernando Valley (Los Angeles Valley College, Los Angeles Pierce College, Los Angeles Mission College), and south central Los Angeles (Southwest College).

Precise identification of the handicapped population in Los Angeles County is difficult if not impossible. Reasonable approximation, however, can be made. The California State Department of Rehabilitation has estimated that there are some 800,000 unemployed handicapped individuals between the ages of 18 and 64 in Los Angeles County. Of these, it is estimated that 100,000 could benefit in some way from academic-vocational education and rehabilitation training, and that some 50,000 will at some point obtain training.

Since the Los Angeles Community College District encompasses approximately one half of the total Los Angeles County population, there are within our boundaries an estimated 25,000 handicapped individuals who could benefit from community college education, training, services and resources. While this number is perhaps too large to be realistic in terms of potential students, it does indicate a large population concentration of clients with specific needs which could be fulfilled by community college programs in vocational education, skill training, and job placement.

During the 1976/77 fiscal year, the computer printout showed approximately 15,000 categories of handicaps in students registered in the Los Angeles Community College District. Within those 15,000 categories, and after a needs assessment was conducted, there were 2,638 students receiving direct services from the programs for the handicapped established at each college. Following is a breadown of handicapped student enrollment by disability, and by college, in the Los Angeles Community College District.

See Table I on the following page for breakdown by college.

TABLE I

BREAKDOWN BY COLLEGE

	District-wide	City College	East Los Angeles	Harbor	Mission	Pierce	Southwest	Trade Tech	Valley	West Los Angeles
I. Physical Disability										
A. Vision Deficit	225	102	19	4	2	36	10	6	44	2
B. Mobility/ Orthopedic Deficit	1,071	238	86	93	5	211	9	55	294	80
C. Other Health Deficits	641	132	39	15	5	116	31	47	204	52
II. Communication Disability										
A. Hearing Deficit	379	10	9	1	0	188	21	117	28	5
B. Speech Deficit	61	2	13	17	0	7	4	5	10	3
III. Learning Disability										
A. Neurological Deficit	150	14	0	18	10	46	38	16	½	3
B. Biochemical Deficit	5	N/A	0		5		0		0	
C. Developmental Deficit	106	N/A	28		35	34	1	4	4	
TOTAL	2,638	498	194	148	62	638	114	251	589	145

SECTION III

PROGRAM GOALS

There is at least one program goal for each program area. Each area corresponds to a budget category as previously described.

The goals are:

AREA A

SPECIAL FACILITIES.

The District-wide Handicap Programs shall insure equal physical access to the educational opportunities offered by the District for all eligible handicap students by providing adequate space, special equipment and/or furniture, and removing identified architectural barriers.

AREA B

SPECIAL EDUCATION MATERIALS

The District-wide Handicap Programs will insure equal academic access to all eligible handicapped students by providing special education materials as needed.

AREA C

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The District-wide Handicap Programs will insure equal educational opportunities for all eligible handicapped students by providing special support personnel and resources as needed.

AREA D

MOBILITY ASSISTANCE

The District's Handicap Programs will insure physical equal access to the educational opportunities offered at the District for all eligible handicapped students through the provision of designated personnel or equipment to assist those students to move about efficiently in the educational setting on campus.

AREA E

TRANSPORTATION

The District's Handicap Programs will conduct a feasibility study to determine the cost and benefits of providing transportation to and from all nine colleges to eligible handicapped students.
Selected Handicap Programs within the District will put forth pilot transportation cost and benefit data.

SECTION III (Cont'd)

PROGRAM GOALS (Cont'd)

AREA F

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

The District's Handicap Programs will insure equal physical, academic and vocational opportunities for all eligible handicapped students by providing an efficient program management system which will implement the provisions of Education Code Section 18151.

SECTION IV

SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

The Fall of 1974 marked the first widespread efforts of the LACCE to inaugurate special programs and services. In many cases, excellent programs were already in existence with limited funding, but new funding allowed more handicapped students greater access to the community colleges. In order to limit the amount of funds required for necessary structural modification, colleges have agreed that certain steps be taken to determine costs and priorities. Included is the agreement that certain colleges specialize in particular programs.

While promoting greater awareness among college personnel and the community of the needs of handicapped students in general, and while providing a wide range of special services to all handicapped students, the Enablers have also developed pilot programs and services for particular disabilities. The idea behind this project is to expand the pilot programs to all colleges on a limited basis.

Specialization will not restrict a student's freedom to attend any college, but it is expected that students with particular disabilities will naturally gravitate to the campuses with outstanding programs serving those disabilities. Under this system of district-wide planning, each major disability will be served through a first-class program by at least one District college.

1. CITY specializes in programs for the visually impaired, with services to orthopedically impaired and speech impaired students. Specialization in programs for the visually impaired at City was easily facilitated as City is adjacent to the Braille Institute.

2. EAST specializes in speech impairment programs, with other services to the hearing impaired, health impaired and others. The basis for an excellent program for the developmentally disabled already exists at East.

3. HARBOR specializes in programs for the orthopedically handicapped with great emphases on the severely disabled.

4. MISSION, during the 1977-78 school year will develop a learning disabilities program which will not require major architectural modifications. As soon as a permanent campus is acquired, Mission will expand its services to the physically disabled.

5. PIERCE specializes in programs for deaf and/or hearing impaired students, with support services to orthopedically impaired, blind, and other disabled students. Pierce is located near California State University, Northridge, which has an outstanding program to train professionals to work with the deaf and maintain close liaison with them.

6. VALLEY specializes in programs for orthopedically handicapped students, with services to the hearing impaired, visually handicapped, speech impaired, and most other disabilities. Valley already has an excellent program for the orthopedically handicapped and has made great progress

toward providing additional services for persons otherwise handicapped. A job readiness and placement program is in the developmental stage.

7. SOUTHWEST has implemented a program for deaf and/or hearing impaired students primarily from South Central Los Angeles. Special classes are offered for students to aid them in succeeding in their regular integrated classes. The college is in the process of building up its program to better serve all disabilities.

8. TRADE TECH specializes in programs for the deaf and/or hearing impaired, with excellent services to most disabilities. Many handicapped students are now actively enrolled in numerous vocational and academic courses. This college houses one of the most outstanding Nurses' Aide and LVN programs for the totally deaf in the world. In 1976, the first five totally deaf nurses in the world graduated from Trade Tech.

9. WEST has been serving several disabled groups on a limited basis and is expected to specialize in learing disabilities. As soon as permanent buildings are completed, West will expand its services to the physically disabled.

The agreements on college specialization were made for long-term programs, but because immediate structural modifications are being made to provide greater access to handicapped students on all the campuses, we expect that strong services for all disabilities will be provided equally.

SERVICES AT THE DIFFERENT COLLEGES

These services differ according to the resources available on any given campus, and on the individual needs of the disabled students involved. These services include:

1. On-Campus Services

Academic Counseling
Personal Counseling
Vocational Counseling
Interpreter Services
Job Placement
Mobility Assistance
Mobility Orientation
Peer Counseling
Test/Evaluation
Testing Assistance
Peer Tutoring
Individual Tutoring
Registration Assistance
Reader Services
Transcribing Services
Lecture Note Taking
Speech Therapy
Adaptive Physical Education
Resource Room Supplementary-Learning Experiences
Campus Resources Coordination

On Campus Transportation
Clubs and Orgainzation for Disabled Students
Inservices Training for College Staff and Faculty
Student Activities and Recreational Programs

2. Special Facilities

Elevator Keys
Braille Trails
Special Services Center
Removal and/or Modification of Campus Buildings and Facilities
Special Library and Learning Center Facilities
Special Equipment
Special Materials
Special Parking

3. Community Activities

Public and Private Agencies and College Coordination
Job Market Analysis
Job Development
Job Placement
News Releases and Related Publicity
Coordination of Off-Campus Transportation
Recruitment Efforts
Referrals to Off-Campus Agencies and Services
Handicap Population Survey
Community Needs Assessment
Clubs, Committee and Boards Participation
Awareness Training Programs

SECTION V

BUDGET SUMMARY

1976-77 District-wide Budget

The District-wide Handicap Program Management and Evaluation plan recognizes the need for not only budget information, but also the desirability of having budget category information directly related to program objectives and activity attainment.

Table II

TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT

	EXPENDITURE OBJECT CODES - Budget and Accounting Manual						TOTAL EXPENDITURES
	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	
Special Facilities					6,749	54,298	61,047
Special Educational Materials				18,995			18,995
Special Educational Assistance	535,771	430,132					965,903
Mobility Assistance		8,626					8,626
Transportation					1,218		1,218
Program Developmental Services		2,000			16,308		18,308
TOTAL	$535,771	$440,758		$18,995	$24,275	$54,298	$1,074,097

SECTION VI

BUDGET SUMMARY

1977-78 District Wide Budget

The undistributed district-wide monies are set aside awaiting state approval.

Table III

TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT.

	EXPENDITURE OBJECT CODES - Budget and Accounting Manual						TOTAL EXPENDITURES
	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	
Special Facilities				3,000	15,065	107,590	125,655
Special Educational Materials				14,658		125	14,783
Special Educational Assistance	700,710	580,251		2,290		9,500	1,292,751
Mobility Assistance	10,548	29,779			1,500	1,938	43,765
Transportation		11,140			8,000		19,140
Program Developmental Services		13,606		400	16,403		30,409
TOTAL	711,258	634,776		20,348	40,968	119,153	$1,526,503

SECTION VII

COMBINED PROGRAM AREAS, OBJECTIVES AND COST BENEFIT MATRIX

Table IV

The following is a list of the Proposed Program and Service Areas in summary form.

Program Areas	Area Components	Number of Objectives and Activities	Total Dollar Amount	
			1976-77	1977-78
A. Special Facilities	A1.0 Architectural Barriers A2.0 Special Equipment	6 8	61,047	125,655
B. Special Education Materials	B. 0 Materials	4	18,995	14,733
C. Special Educational Assistance	C1.0 General C2.0 In Class Services C3.0 Out of Class Services	2 17 22	965,903	1,292,751
D. Mobility Assistance	D1.0 Personal D2.0 Equipment	4 3	8,626	43,765
E. Transportation	E1.0 Off Campus	3	1,218	19,140
F. Program Developmental Services	F1.0 Inservice Training F2.0 Information Dissemination F3.0 Community Participation F4.0 Collection of Data F5.0 Recruitment F6.0 Administration and Evaluation of District-wide Programs	11 7 1 4 3	13,308	30,409
TOTALS: 6 Areas	13 Area Components	110	$1,074,097	$1,526,503

SECTION VII (Cont'd)

These areas are the same as the financial budget categories specified by the Education Code Section 18151, so that we may at some later date determine cost benefit for each program area. The number of area components does not reflect the budget allocations. A program area with two area components may have a bigger budget allocation than an area with six area components since some of the objectives or activities in the components may be no-cost related on a direct form.

For example under the area of Program developmental services, objectives F2.0 (7), F3.0 (1), F4.0 (4) are not cost related since the administrative costs are absorbed under the salaries in the special education assistance area.

All 110 program objectives from the six program areas together with the management timeline for the entire $1.5 million program are shown in the publication "Handicap Program Management and Evaluation Comprehensive Plan", Division of Educational Planning and Development, Career and Occupational Education - Handicapped, Los Angeles Community Colleges.

Please address requests to Ms. Victoria Schmoeller, District Coordinator, Programs and Services for the Handicapped, Los Angeles Community College District, 2140 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90006, or telephone 213/380-6000.

SECTION VIII

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The District-wide Handicap Programs will be evaluated following the format in the Management System. The evaluation will be divided into the following components:

A. Questionnaires on the Services and Programs to:

1. Students
2. Instructors of Special Classes
3. Faculty members
4. Program staff
5. Coordinators of handicap programs
6. Handicap Advisory Council Members

B. Reports on the results of the questionnaires.

C. Continuous self-evaluation by program staff.

D. Two evaluation visitations (beginning and end of F.Y.) by teams composed of:

1. A consultant for the L.A. County's Research and Evaluation Division.
2. The L.A. District Coordinator of Programs and Services for the Handicapped.
3. Three Coordinators of College Handicap Programs.

E. A final report on the evaluation with recommendation will be prepared and presented to the California Community Colleges Academic Affairs Unit, and the Los Angeles Community College District Administration.

SECTION IX

EXAMPLES OF OBJECTIVES IN SELECTED PROGRAM CATEGORIES

A. SPECIAL FACILITIES; A1.0 ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS; A1.1 - By July, 1977, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will establish a priority list for future removal of previously identified Architectural Barriers [to be measured by a priority list, Form A1.2 (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

B. SPECIAL EDUCATION MATERIALS; B1.1 - By June 30, 1977, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will request special education materials needed for the program [to be measured by the budget activity line items requested by the Campus Coordinator in the budget operational plan (kept by the District Coordinator in the Coordinator's office)].

C. SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE; C1.1 - On a continuous basis, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will be responsible for conducting an intake review process of each handicapped student to assess his/her educational needs both In Class or Out of Class [to be measured by student's information folder (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

C1.2 - On a continuous basis, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will have a summary form and educational needs statement of the handicapped students in their programs [to be measured by form, with eligible students by disability and educational program (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

C2.3 - When appropriate, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West will monitor the existing special classes to insure that they meet standards set by the Educational Code and the Council of Instruction [to be measured by memo to District Coordinator)].

C2.4 - By March 1, 1978, all instructors of Special Education classes mentioned in Objective C1.3 above -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley and West -- will complete a questionnaire on class content, student participation and suggestions for improvement [to be measured by completed questionnaire (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

C2.6 - By March 1, 1978, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will question a sample of students on their rating of special classes [to be measured by completed questionnaire (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

SECTION IX (Cont'd)

C2.15 - By March 1, 1978, a sample of college instructors who have support staff and/or professional assistance in their classes -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will complete a questionnaire regarding services rendered by the support staff and/or professional assistants to Campus Coordinator of handicap services [to be measured by completed questionnaire by instructors (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

C3.12 - By March 1, 1978, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will see that students rate their level of satisfaction with the academic advisement received through the program [to be measured by questionnaire from students (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

C3.20 - On a continuous basis the Job Development Officer at City and Valley Colleges will coordinate job development placement of qualified handicapped students [to be measured by monthly progress report to the Campus Coordinator (Form C2.18) (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

D. MOBILITY ASSISTANCE; D1.0 PERSONAL ASSISTANCE; D1.1 - On a continuous basis the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West will coordinate personal mobility assistance with those handicapped students who need it [to be measured by time schedule of mobility student assistants (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

E. TRANSPORTATION; E1.1 On a continuous basis the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following college -- East -- will coordinate off-campus transportation for those handicapped students, who, in the opinion of the coordinator, need it [to be measured by time schedules of personnel (student assistant, clerk, driver's attendant, etc.) budget and accounting (kept by Campus Coordinator's office)].

F. DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES: F1.0 INSERVICE TRAINING F1.1 - On a monthly basis, the District Coordinator of handicap programs will hold inservice and business meetings with all nine Campus Coordinators and/or their designees [to be measured by agenda and/or minutes (kept by District Coordinator in Coordinator's office)].

F1.3 - On a monthly basis, all nine coordinators will host a two-hour inservice session to their fellow coordinators during the monthly business meeting [to be measured by agenda and minutes of session (kept by District Coordinator in Coordinator's office)].

F1.7 - At least once per month, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will hold inservice meetings with their staff [to be measured by agenda (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

SECTION IX (Cont'd)

F1.9 - By March 1, 1978, the Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges -- City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, and West -- will question a sample of students in their ratings of their level of satisfaction of the services performed by the staff in the program [to be measured by completed questionnaire by student (kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

F3.0 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION F3.1 - On a continuous basis, Campus Coordinators, with the assistance of the District Coordinator, will establish and maintain at each college an advisory committee, as per Title V, Section 56030 [to be measured by agenda, minutes, or roster of members (kept by Campus Coordinator in Coordinator's office)].

F4.1 - By July, 1977, the District Coordinator and Campus Coordinator, with assistance from the District data processing office, will establish a computerized disabled students data base, district-wide [to be measured by date base (Rept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's office)].

APPENDIX I

DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION SERVICES NOW OFFERED BY THE DIVISION OF PROGRAM EVALUATION, RESEARCH, AND PUPIL SERVICES

THE THREE INITIAL PROGRAM EVALUATION SERVICES

In the acknowledgement section of this paper it was mentioned that the following three initial evaluation services evolved in the Los Angeles County Office. These initial services, offered through the Division of Program Evaluation, Research, and Pupil Services are: (1) Educational Program Evaluation Planning Assistance, (2) Educational Program Audit Assistance, and (3) Research and Evaluation Support.

I. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION PLANNING ASSISTANCE

Local educational agencies may elect to receive Educational Program Evaluation Planning Assistance prior to having an audit of a program, or they may elect to have this service without later having an audit. Educational Program Evaluation Assistance is a service which is intended to strengthen the internal process of evaluation in a local educational agency. In collaboration with a County consultant , the local evaluator, and/or his or her team, designs an effective evaluation system that includes statistical procedures and the development of performance objectives, process objectives, evaluation specifications, the evaluation design, and related documents.

II. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AUDIT ASSISTANCE

Local educational agencies may elect to have an Educational Program Audit. The Educational Program Audit is a performance control process based upon external reviews conducted by qualified outside consultants. It is designed to verify the results of the evaluation of an educational program and to assess the appropriateness of evaluation procedures used for determining the effectiveness of the operation and management of the program.

III. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION SUPPORT

An evaluator at a local educational agency may elect to receive assistance in this area. This would include statistical data analysis, data synthesis, and evaluation report writing and interpretation.

For further information on these and other evaluation services (such as Evaluation Implementation Assistance) offered, or in order to arrange for assistance in these areas, please contact:

Dr. Gordon Footman, Director
Division of Program Evaluation, Research, and Pupil Services
Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
9300 E. Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

GOAL

AREA A: SPECIAL FACILITIES

The Districtwide Handicap Programs shall assure equal physical access to the educational opportunities offered by the District for all eligible handicapped students by providing adequate space, special equipment and/or furniture, and removing identified architectural barriers.

TARGET GROUP	TASK TO BE PERFORMED	HOW TASK WILL BE MEASURED	DATE OF COMPLETION	DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT	COMMENTS
A. SPECIAL FACILITIES					
A1.0 ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS					
A1.1 The Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges: City, East, Harbor, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, West	Will identify remaining Architectural Barriers on their campus.	List of identified Architectural Barriers (Form A1.1) (Kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's Office.)	June, 1977		
A1.2 The Campus Coordinator of handicap programs at the following colleges: City, East, Harbor, Pierce, Southwest, Trade Tech, Valley, West	Will establish a priority list for future removal of previously identified Architectural Barriers.	Priority list Form A1.2 (Kept by Campus Coordinator in Campus Coordinator's Office.)	July, 1977		
A1.3 The nine Campus Coordinators of handicap programs & the District Coordinator & other District Personnel	Will identify funding sources for removal of Architectural Barriers in the school year 1978-79.	Check on Federal Register (Kept by District Coordinator in Coordinator's Office.)	May, 1978		

APPENDIX III

FORMAT FOR EVALUATION TIMELINE

EVALUATION TIMELINE
77 - 78 SCHOOL YEAR

TASKS	DATE OF COMPLETION	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	District Coordinator	Program Enabler	Evaluation Team	Instructors	Staff	Students	COMMENTS
C2.8 Designation of Support Staff Leader	Continuous														X					
C2.9 Monitor Support Staff In Class	Continuous														X			X		
C2.10 Identify Support Staff by Title	Continuous														X			X		
C2.11 Questionnaire to Support Staff Leader	Mar. 78									X								X		
C2.12 Report to District Coordinator	Apr. 1978										X				X					
C2.13 Questionnaire to Students on Staff	Mar. 1978									X									X	
C2.14 Report to District Coordinator	Apr. 1978										X				X					
C2.15 Instructors/Support Staff Questionnaire	Mar. 1978									X							X			
C2.16 Report to District Coordinator	Apr. 1978										X				X					
C2.17 List of All Personnel Giving In Class Service	Continuous														X			X		
C3.0 OUT OF CLASS SERVICES																				
C3.1 Designation of Support Staff Leader	Continuous														X					
C3.2 Monitor Support Staff Out Of Class	Continuous														X			X		
C3.3 Identify Support Staff by Title	Continuous														X			X		
C3.4 Questionnaire to Support Staff Leader	Mar. 1978									X								X		
C3.5 Report on Questionnaire	Apr. 1978										X				X					
C3.6 Questionnaire to Students on Out Of Class Service	Mar. 1978									X									X	
C3.7 Report to District Coordinator on Out of Class Services	Apr. 1978										X				X					

INTAKE FORM

STUDENT'S NAME _____ SPECIALIST OR COUNSELOR _____

College ☐ (1) Semester ☐ (2) Year ☐☐ (3) Card Code S I H / S J (5) Effective Date ☐☐ M ☐☐ D ☐☐ Y (7 ...)

I.D Number ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (13 ... 21) Birth Date ☐☐ M ☐☐ D ☐☐ Y (22 27) Married ☐ (28) Single ☐ Previously Married ☐ (...) No of Dep Children ☐ (...)

1. DISABILITIES (Enter '1' for the primary disability. Enter '2' for secondary disabilities)

- ☐ (32) VISUAL LIMITATION
- ☐ (33) HEARING LIMITATION
- ☐ (34) SPEECH & LANGUAGE
- ☐ (35) MOBILITY ORTHOPEDIC
- ☐ (36) OTHER _____
- ☐ (37) L.D. NEUROLOGICAL
- ☐ (38) L.D. BIOCHEMICAL
- L.D. DEVELOPMENTAL
  - ☐ (39) Average Potential
  - ☐ (40) Limited Potential

Professionally Assessed Yes ☐ (41) No ☐

Age at onset of primary disability ☐☐ (42)

Primary disability is (check one) Moderate ☐ (44) Severe ☐ (45)

(check one) Temporary ☐ (46) Permanent ☐ (47) Progressive ☐ (48)

OPTIONAL

2. INCOME SOURCES. Check appropriate boxes

- ☐ (49) VETERANS AID
- ☐ (50) SSDI
- ☐ (51) WORKMANS COMP & DISABILTY
- ☐ (52) SCHOLARSHIPS, GRANTS, FIN. AID
- ☐ (53) A.F.D.C.
- ☐ (54) OTHER _____
- ☐ (55) D.P.S.S
- ☐ (56) A.P.S.S.B
- ☐ (57) RETIREMENT OR SS
- ☐ (58) PARENT/FAMILY
- ☐ (59) SPOUSE
- ☐ (60) SELF

OPTIONAL

3. WORK FORCE STATUS ON ENTRY: (check one)

- Employed ☐ (61) Full Time ☐ (62) Part-Time
- Unemployed ☐ (63) Looking for work
- ☐ (64) Not looking for work

4. PRIMARY REFERRAL SOURCE: (check one)

- ☐ (65) DPSS
- ☐ (66) DEPT OF REHABILITATION
- ☐ (67) HIGH SCHOOL
- ☐ (68) FACULTY/STAFF
- ☐ (69) PUBLICITY
- ☐ (70) OTHER _____

5. DEPT OF REHABILITATION CLIENT ☐ (71) Yes ☐ No Counselor _____ Office _____

6. OTHER SERVICES USED (check appropriate boxes)

- ☐ (26) Academic Counseling
- ☐ (27) Vocational Counseling
- ☐ (28) Personal Counseling
- ☐ (29) Job Development Placement
- ☐ (31) Special Instruction
- ☐ (32) Tutoring Services
- ☐ (33) Instructional Assistance
- ☐ (34) Attendant Services
- ☐ (35) Peer Counseling, Tutoring
- ☐ (37) Speech Therapy
- ☐ (38) Interpreting Services
- ☐ (39) Note Taking Services
- ☐ (40) Reader/Taper Services
- ☐ (41) Transcribing Services
- ☐ (42) Mobility Assistance
- ☐ (43) Testing Assistance
- ☐ (44) Special Equipment
- ☐ (45) Special Materials
- ☐ (46) Special Parking
- ☐ (47) Transportation Off Campus
- ☐ (48) Co-Curricular Activities
- ☐ (49) Referral _____ Specify
- ☐ (50) Other _____ Specify

I HAVE READ OR BEEN INFORMED OF THE ABOVE INFORMATION I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION IS CORRECT

Student's Signature _____

Date 31

ERA 105

BIBLIOGRAPHY I

SUGGESTED REFERENCES FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM EVALUATION AND AUDIT

Anderson, Scarvia B. Ball, Samuel, Murphy, Richard, & Associates. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Barnes, Fred P. Research for the Practitioner in Education. Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1972.

Bell, T. O., Hagans, R.W., Harper, R. R., and Segar, J.E. A System of Comprehensive Educational Planning and Evaluation. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1971.

Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Blood, R. E., Brown, G. I , Thomas, M., and Brubaker, D. L. The Study of Unmet Educational Needs: A Discrepancy Score Approach. Instruction book. Santa Barbara, California: Tri-County Educational Service Center, March, 1969.

Bloom, Benjamin S., Hastings, J. Thomas, and Madaus, George F. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Booklets for Developing Evaluative Skills. Tucson: Educational Innovators Press, A Division of Becom Corp., Booklets 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8.

Buros, O.K. The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972; 1965; 1959; etc.

California Evaluation Improvement Project, Workshop Training Materials. Sacramento California State Department of Education. Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1975. Plakos, John. Determining Evaluation Purpose and Requirements; Plakos, Marie. Determining Evaluation Plan and Procedures; Finley, Carmen. Obtain Assessment Tools; Kennedy, Arlene. Collect Data; Rotzel, Alice. Analyze Data; Babcock, Robert. Reporting Results; Price, Nelson. Apply Evaluation Findings.

California State Department of Education. Focus on Promising Practices of Needs Assessment. Sacramento: Bureau of Program Planning and Development, 1974. 59 pages. ED 107 745.

California State Department of Education. Technical Assistance Guide for Proficiency Assessment.

Campbell, D. T., and Stanley, J. C. Experimental & Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1968.

Campbell, Paul B. "Needs Assessment in Educational Planning." Educational Planning, 1, 1(May 1974), pp.34-40. EJ 099 389.

Campbell, V. N., and Markle, D. G. Identifying and Formulating Educational Problems. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, December 1967.

Center for the Study of Evaluation. An Introduction to the Center. Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, September 1974.

Comrey, A. L., Backer, J. E., & Claser, E. M. A Sourcebook for Mental Health Measures. Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973.

Cook, Desmond L. Program Evaluation and Review Technique. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

Cox, James. Basics of Questionnaire Construction in Educational Settings. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1976.

Delbecq, Andre L., and Andrew H. Van de Ven. "A Group Process Model for Problem Identification and Program Planning," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 7 (November 4, 1971), 466-92.

Dell, D. L., and Meeland, T. Needs Assessment Scaling Procedures. Position paper. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, May 15, 1973.

Developing Observation Systems. Tucson: Education Innovators Press.

Developing Useful Objectives. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975.

Drake, E. Maylon. "The Educational Program Audit." The School Administrator. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, July 1973.

Educational Accountability: A Format for Monitoring the Teaching-Learning Process. Tucson: Educational Innovators Press.

Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means. NSSE Yearbook, LXVIII, Part II, 1969, University of Chicago Press.

Educational Needs Assessment. A Simulation Model for Humanistic Planning. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, Center for Community Needs Assessment, May 1973.

Educational Program Audit. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1973.

Education Program Evaluation Assistance Handbook. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1974.

Englehart, M. D. Methods of Educational Research. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally & Co., 1972.

Florida Educational Research and Development Council Research Bulletin: "Needs Assessment Materials: An Annotated Bibliography." Gainsville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, University of Florida, 1976.

Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.

Glossary of Measurement Terms, California Test Bureau. Del Monte Research Park, Monterey, California: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Gottman, J. M., and Clasen, R. E. Evaluation in Education, A Practitioner's Guide. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Gronlund, N. E. Stating Behavioral Objectives for Classroom Instruction. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1970.

Haggart, Sue A., and Rapp, Marjorie L. Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Demonstration Programs. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1972.

Hershkowitz, M. Statewide Educational Needs Assessment. Results from Selected Model States. Silver Spring, Maryland: Hershkowitz Associates, 1974.

Hoepfner, R., Bradley, P. A., Kline, S. P., and Alkin, M. C. A Guidebook for CSE/Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

Hoepfner, Ralph, et al. CSE Elementary School Test Evaluations. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Hoepfner, Ralph, et al. CSE-ECRC Preschool Kindergarten Test Evaluations. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Hoepfner, Ralph, et al. CSE-RBS Test Evaluations: Tests of Higher-Order Cognitive, Affective, and Interpersonal Skills. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, 1972.

Hoepfner, R., Nelken, I., Bradley, P. A., Strickland, G. P., Williams, R. C., Woolley, D. C., and Barnes, D. Report on the Field Testing of the CSE Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment. CSE Report No. 70. Los Angeles, California: University of California at Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation, September 1971.

Isaac, Stephen, and Michael, William B. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knopp, 1974.

Jacobs, T. O. Developing Questionnaire Items: How to do it Well. Alexandria, Virginia: Human Resources Research Organization, 1974.

Kaplan, B. A. Needs Assessment in Education. A Planning Handbook for School Districts. Trenton, New Jersey: Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, February 1974.

Kaufman, R. A. A System Approach to Education: Derivation and Definition. Audiovisual Communication Review. 16:4(Winter 1968), 415-24.

Kester, Donald L. "The State of the Art & Science of Educational Program Evaluation Services (K-14) in Los Angeles County as Experienced by One Los Angeles County Consultant." In ERIC, ED 104 919.

Kester, Donald L., Gordon E. Footman, and Warren B. Newman. "What Will Be the Impact of Collective Bargaining on the Evaluation of California State or Federally Funded Programs?" This is the text of a presentation delivered at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association in Burlingame, California on November 18, 1976. Submitted to ERIC.

Kester, Donald L., Robert M. Alworth, and Eve-Marie Arce Winn. "A Child Care Center's Program at Eight Community Colleges is Evaluated and Audited." This is the text of a presentation made at the 1975 Annual Conference of the California Society of Educational Program Auditors and Evaluators in San Diego, CA (mimeo).

Kester, Donald L., Mary Hearne, and Phyllis West. "Report on a Needs Assessment and Evaluation of a Drug Education Program." In ERIC. ED 122 905 (22 pages) [Pub Date -- April, 1976].

Kester, Donald L., and Robert D. Wertz. "The Design, Evaluation, and Educational Program Audit of a District-Wide K-12 Mentally Gifted Minor Program." In ERIC. ED 115 061 (15 pages). This is the text of a speech delivered at the 1975 Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Kester, Donald L., and Patricia Lotz. "Are We Helping Our Educationally Handicapped Students?" In ERIC. ED 116 437 (21 pages). This the text of a speech delivered at the 1975 California Educational Research Association Conference in San Diego.

Kester, Donald L., and Kevin Galvin. "A Decision Making Model to Identify and Install Promising College Programs." In ERIC. ED 760 220 (36 pages). This is the test of a speech delivered at the California Association for Institutional Research in San Francisco, February 1975.

Kibler, J. R., et al. Behavioral Objectives and Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Klausmeier, H. S., et al. Individually Guided Education and the Multiunit Elementary School: Guidelines for Implementation. Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971.

Klein, S., Fenstermacher, G., and Alkin, M. C. The Center's Changing Evaluation Model. Evaluation Comment. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Center for the Study of Evaluation, 2:4(1971), 9-11.

Klein, Stephen P., et al. Evaluation Workshop I - An Orientation. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Klein, Stephen P., and Jacqueline Kosecoff. Issues and Procedures in the Development of Criterion-Referenced Tests. Princeton, New Jersey: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation (TM Report 26). September 1973.

KOCE-TV Needs Assessment Surveys: Target Population Reactor Groups. Costa Mesa, California: Coast Community College District, and Washington, D.C.: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, April 1974. ERIC: ED 093 403.

Lessinger, Leon. Every Kid, A Winner. Accountability in Education, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1971.

Lyman, Howard. Test Scores and What They Mean. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Maner, R. F. Preparing Instructional Objective. Palo Alto, California: Fearen Publishers, 1962.

Management by Objectives and Results: A guidebook for Today's School Executive. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

McCollough, T., Markley, O. W., and Moser, M. Futuring: A Futures Primer for Local Education Agencies. Research Report No. 14 of Project Simu-School: Santa Clara County Component. San Jose, California: Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools, September 1974.

Messick, Samuel. "The Standard Problem: Meaning and Values in Measurement and Evaluation," American Psychologist. Vol. 30, No. 10, 955-66.

Metfessel, N. S., and W. B. Michael. "A Paradigm Involving Multiple Criterion Measures for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of School Programs." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1967, (27) 931-943.

Mullen, David J., and Mullen, Rosemary C. A Principal's Handbook for Conducting a Needs Assessment Using the School Program Bonanza Game. (1974). 69 pages. ED 113 809.

Newman, Warren B., Program Evaluation for Program Improvement: Research Implications. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1976.

Nitko, A.J. "Problems in the Development of Criterion-Referenced Tests: The IPI Pittsburg Experience," in Center for the Study of Evaluation Monograph Series in Evaluation No. 3. Problems in Criterion-Referenced Measurement. Los Angeles: University of California, 1974.

Olson, Gerald T., Barbara Cohen-Benjamin, and Donald L. Kester. "Evaluating and Auditing a Community College Learning Skills Center Program." Presented to the 1976 Annual Conference of Educational Program Auditors and Evaluators, Oakland, California. ERIC. ED 138 408.

Olson, Gerald T., Conducting a Community College Counseling Needs Assessment. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. 1976. ED 121 366 (9 pages).

Olson, Gerald T., "Evaluating and Auditing a Community College Learning Skills," second year. Presented to the 1976 Annual Conference of Educational Program Auditors and Evaluators, Oakland, California. ERIC ED 138 331.

Opinion Research Corporation. Goals for Elementary and Secondary Public Schools in New Jersey. A Survey Among New Jersey Residents. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education, February 1972.

Plakos, John, Plakos, Marie P., and Babcock, Robert W. Developing Useful Objectives. California Evaluation Improvement Project, Sacramento. California State Department of Education. Office of Program Evaluation Research, 1975.

Popham, W. James. An Evaluation Guidebook, A set of Practical Guidelines for the Educational Evaluator. Los Angeles: The Instructional Objective Exchange, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1972.

Popham, W. James. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975

_____ Evaluating Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

_____ (ed.) Evaluation in Education: Current Applications. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974.

Popham, W. James. Instructional Objectives Exchange, A Project of the Center for the Study of Evaluation. Los Angeles: UCLA Graduate School of Education.

_____ Instructor's Manual to Experimental Designs for School Research. Los Angeles, California: Vimcet Associates, 1969.

Price, Nelson C. Glossary of Terms Related to Educational Evaluation. Northern Development Center, California Program Evaluation Improvement Project, San Mateo County Office of Education.

Proposal for Consolidated Planning. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1974.

Psychomotor Needs Assessment of Virginia School Children. Richmond: Virginia State Department of Education. Federal Programs Office, May, 1973.

Rasp, A., Jr. Consensus Formation on Educational Outcomes Using a Modified Delphi Technique. Olympia: Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972. ERIC: ED 090 363.

Russell, Dale, John Plakos, and James Cox. Developing a Workable Needs Assessment Process. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1977.

Russell, Dale, and John Plakos. Developing A Pupil Assessment System for Proficiency-Based Instructional Programs. Downey, California: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1977

Russell, Dale. "Errors Commonly Made in Conducting an Educational Needs Assessment and Some Solution Strategies." invited paper presented at the Educational Needs Assessment National Conference, Oakland, California, April 6, 1976.

Snider, J.G., and Osgood, C.E. Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.

Speak-Up: A Sub-Project Assessing Educational Needs as Perceived by the Community: PROJECT DESIGN. Fresno, California: Interagency Planning for Urban Educational Needs, No. 2. Fresno City Unified School District. May, 1968. ERIC: ED 038 744.

Stake, R. E. School Accountability Laws. Journal of Educational Evaluation. 4:1 (February 1973). 1-3

Stewart, Clifford T. (ed.) Institutional Research and Institutional Policy Formulation. Claremont, California: Association for Institutional Research, 1971.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., and Hammond, R. L. Decision-Making in Education. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Thonis, Eleanor, Plakos, John, Plakos, Marie E., and Babcock, Robert W. Evaluation Considerations for Bilingual-Bicultural Education. California Evaluation Improvement Project, Sacramento, California. California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1975.

Turner, William J. "The Education Program Audit - It's Just Good Business." Management Action Paper. Association of California School Administrators, Vol. 3, No. 3.

Van Dalen, D. B., and Meyer, W. J. Understanding Educational Research. San Francisco, California: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Wiersma, W. Research Methods in Education. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Lippencott, J. B., Company, 1969.

Wilson, J. A. R., Robeck, M. C., and Michael, W. B. Psychological Foundations of Learning and Teaching. San Francisco, California: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Worthen, B. R., and Sanders, J. R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

BIBLIOGRAPHY II

SUGGESTED AND CURRENT REFERENCES

HANDICAPPED PROGRAMS

Bilovsky, David, and Matson, Jane. Community Colleges and the Developmentally Disabled; Training Models for Direct Care Personnel. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. In ERIC ED 136 843 (78 pages) [Pub date 1977]

Black Hawk College: Affirmative Action Plan for Improvement of Equal Opportunities for Members of Minority Groups, Women, and Physically Handicapped. In ERIC ED 124 226 (19 pages) [Pub date March 1974]

Brookey, Jerry M. The Seattle Community College New Program for Deaf People. In ERIC Journal of Rehabilitation for the Deaf pages 52-60 EJ 010 826 July, 1969.

California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor: California State Department of Rehabilitation, Sacramento. Introducing Handicapped Persons as Paraprofessionals in Libraries. A Workshop Co-Sponsored by the California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office and the State Department of Rehabilitation. Summer, 1975. In ERIC ED 115 352 (100 pages).

Cortazzo, Arnold D., and Orkin, Kenneth H. The Mental Retardation Technician Program at Miami-Dade Junior College. In ERIC Journal of Mental Retardation pages 8, 1, 7-11 February, 1970.

Dunn, Cheryl. A Comparison of Academic Achievement of Handicapped Students in Relation to Vocational Rehabilitation Assistance. In ERIC ED 134-260 (31 pages) July, 1976.

Fafard, Mary Beth. Paraprofessionals in Special Education: Update Report. In ERIC ED 112 591 (35 pages) 1975.

Fasteau, Steven. Development of a Community College Program for Handicapped Students. In ERIC EJ 064 869, Journal of Rehabilitation Literature, pages 33, 9, 267-270. September, 1970.

Fellendorf, George W. Technical Training for Deaf Students at a Community College. In ERIC EJ 020 087, Journal of Volta Review, pages 72, 5, 296-302. May, 1970.

Foster, June C. and Kapisovsky, Peggy. Accommodating Students Who Have Physical Disabilities: A Resource Guide for Massachusetts Community Colleges. In ERIC Ed 115 046 (197 pages). August, 1975.

Fuller, Elizabeth.. Black Hawk College: Independence for the Handicapped. In ERIC EJ 107 714, Community and Junior College Journal, pages 45, 9, 28-29. December/January, 1975.

Garrett, Ann and Hastings, Chester R. Intensive Training for Teacher Aides Working with Hearing Impaired Children. In ERIC ED 116 758 (41 pages).

Griffin, Thomas E. A Comparison of the Cognitive Styles of Deaf Students with the Cognitive Styles of Hearing Students. In ERIC ED 132 783 (81 pages) 1976.

Kerstiens, Gene (Editor). Reading--Update: Ideals to Reality: Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Western College Reading Association (7th, Oakland, California, April 4-6, 1974). In ERIC ED 114 796 (201 pages).

Kitt, Wendy and Schuster, Lois. Community College of Baltimore Epilepsy Education Program; Interim Report. March 1975-June 1976. In ERIC ED 130 682 (70 pages), June, 1976.

Low, John. Single Step for Handicapped. In ERIC EJ 126 357, Community and Junior College Journal, pages 46, 3, 18-21, November, 1975.

McAllister, J. and Others. Why Aren't Your Students Learning? In ERIC EJ 051 955, Junior College Journal, pages 42, 6, 24-26, March, 1972.

McClanahan, Ruby F. and Hastings, Chester R. The Development of Individualized Supportive Services for Physically and Sensorially Limited Adults at a Post-Secondary Area Vocational School: Phase I. In ERIC ED 116 759 (39 pages). 1975.

_____. New Day Dawns for the Handicapped. In ERIC EJ 022 974, Journal of the Open Door, pages 6, 3, 19, Summer, 1970.

Proceedings of Iowa Invitational Workshop on Assessment Systems in Career Development Programs. Vocational Assessment Systems: Application in Programs Serving Special Needs Populations. In ERIC ED 106 654, (126 pages) October, 1973.

Proceedings of: Management Improvement Workshop for Administrators of University Affiliated Facilities.(New Orleans, Louisiana, November 12-14, 1973). In ERIC ED 122 138 (163 pages) November, 1973.

Quanty, Michael. 1975 Career Student Follow-Up; Initial Placement. In ERIC ED 126 999 (25 pages) April, 1976.

Rada, Ruth B. Development of a Core Guidance Curriculum to Meet the Needs of the Handicapped Students at East Los Angeles College. In ERIC ED 124 258 (89 pages) June, 1975.

Rappaport, Wanda and Wolenbush, Elizabeth. Tailor-Made Teaching through TICCIT. In ERIC ED 121 328 (16 pages) 1975.

Richmond, Lee Joyce. Single Step Program: Recruitment and Training of Handicapped Adults, Final Report. In ERIC ED 122 571 (56 pages) April, 1976.

Rinnander, Elizabeth. About the Students. In ERIC ED 140 929 (22 pages) July,1977.

Rose, Pearl H. Development of a Plan for Providing Career Information for Handicapped Students. An Analysis of Occupational Descriptions for the Handicapped. Final Report. In ERIC ED 134 791 (280 pages) August, 1976.

Rosenbrier, Gilbert N. Educating the Handicapped in Biomedical Instrumentation. In Technical Education Reporter, EJ 097 415, pages 1,1,58-61, May, 1974.

Schmeller, Kurt R. Attending College When You're Homebound. In ERIC EJ 114 632 Community and Junior College Journal, pages 45, 7, 28-29, April, 1975.

Schneps, Jack A. and Others. Implementation of Strategies for the Handicapped II. In ERIC ED 132 810 (113 pages) July, 1976.

Schneps, Jack A. and Katz, David. College and Industry: Partners in the Handicapped Employment Role (CIPHER). In ERIC ED 132 809 (112 pages) July, 1976.

Tetzlaff, Mary K. S.O.S.: Success Oriented Service. In ERIC Ed 134 809 (22 pages) 1976.

Tuscher, James and Fox, Gary C. Does the Open Door Include the Physically Handicapped? In ERIC EJ 054 667 Journal of Rehabilitation, pages 37, 5, 10-13. September/October, 1971.

Ugland, Richard and Duane, Gail. Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in Higher Education--A Demonstration Project at Three Minnesota Community Colleges. In ERIC ED 135 434 (73 pages) November, 1976.

Weinstein, Joci. Coming Out On Campus: A Program For Handicapped Students. In ERIC EJ 093 366 Community and Junior College Journal, pages 44, 6, 22-44. March, 1974.

Wilkinson, William K. and Others. CAI for the Visually Handicapped: Promising Collaboration Between Two and Four-Year Schools. In ERIC ED 129 351 (9 pages) 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHY III

SELECTED AND CURRENT REFERENCES ON COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES

Alberta Department of Education, Edmonton. Planning and Research Branch. A Cost-Benefit Study of the Alberta Correspondence School. In ERIC Ed 140 470, (375 pages), April, 1977.

Berkowitz, Monroe and Others. An Evaluation of Policy-Related Rehabilitation Research (includes some information on handicapped and cost-benefit analysis). Available from: Praeger Publisher, 111 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York 10003.

Chuang, Ying C. Operations Research and Urban Education. In ERIC ED 089 672 (12 pages) April, 1974. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, 1974.

Chuang, Ying C. A System for Cost Analysis. (An application of the economic concept of system analysis.) In ERIC ED 092 638 (27 pages), April, 1971.

Deterline, William A. Credibility in Training: Part II. Entertainment and Other Self-Inflicting Wounds (includes cost-benefit figures for training specialist.) In ERIC EJ 154 525 Training and Development Journal, pages 44-48, January, 1977.

De Wore, Jack B., and Scott, Robert E. A Societal Cost/Benefit Analysis Model (Vocational-Technical Schools in Kansas.) In ERIC EJ 097 466 Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, pages 11, 3, 37-45, Spring, 1974.

Haveman, Robert H. Benefit-Cost Analysis and Family Planning Programs. In ERIC EJ 159 735 Population and Development Review, pages 2, 1, 37-64, March, 1976.

Kaplan (Marshall), Gans and Kahn. An Evaluation of Newgate and Other Prison Education Programs (includes a cost-benefit section). Available from: National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia, 22151.

Lamoureux, Marvin E. Planning, Programming and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) and Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA): Economic Considerations for Adult Education. Occasional Paper No. 5. (Includes scope and limitations of CBA.) In ERIC ED 113 552 (62 pages), July, 1975.

Management and Information System for Occupational Education. Field Test Results of the MISOE Management Information System for Occupational Education Program Cost Accounting System for Occupational Programs, CDS Document No. 10. In ERIC ED 115 866 (43) pages, August, 1975.

McCalley, Hazel S. Evaluations of Upward Bound for the Office of Economic Opportunity. (Includes a cost-benefit analysis of the program.) In ERIC ED 105 032 (63 pages), 1969.

McGowan, Francis A. and McGowan, Francis A.,II. An Analysis of Vocational Education in Danbury, Connecticut, 1969-1970: An Application of Systems Analysis to Educational Programs, Allocations, and Benefits. (Emphasis on Danbury High School). In ERIC ED 114 613 (33 pages), May, 1972.

McIntyre, Patrick J. Costs, Benefits and/or Liabilities for the Western Washington State College Teachers Corps: Teacher Designed Inservice Project. In ERIC ED 129 805 (60 pages), September, 1976.

National Analysts, Inc. A Follow-Up Study of Closed Vocational Rehabilitation Cases. A cost/benefit analyses of services provided was conducted. Available from: National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151.

Neenan, William B. Benefit-Cost Analysis and the Evaluation of Mental Retardation Programs. In ERIC Ed 075 960 (34 pages), March, 1973.

Newton, Robert D. PPBS in Higher Education: The Impossible Dream? In ERIC ED 140 719 (21 pages), October, 1976.

Parker, Charles A. Cost-Benefit Analysis in Non-Traditional Education. In ERIC ED 113 998 (5 pages), April, 1975.

Purley, Anthony F. Bilingual and Bicultural Education for American Indians. (The author calls for cost-benefit analysis in this area). In ERIC ED 113 093 (34 pages), 1974.

Stromsdorfer, Ernst W. and Moayed-Dadkhah, Kamran. A Pilot Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of the Economic and Educational Impact of the Mountain-Plains Education and Economic Development Program, Inc. A Research Study for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Revised May, 1976. In ERIC ED 131 987 (252 pages), May, 1976.

Swanson, Austin D. A Study of the Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness of Occupational Education. In ERIC ED 120 523 (96 pages), March, 1976.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 24 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES